

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated July 11, 2007. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

### **Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to further characterize the printer cradle and the use of multiple print engine controllers to match the processing capacity of the cradle to the performance of the cartridge. This aspect of the printer cradle is described in detail in the "Controller Board" subsection beginning at page 14, and shown in Figure 32 and 33.

Claim 2 has been amended to correct some typographical errors.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

### **Claims – 35 USC§103**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,672,699 to Jeong in view of US Publication 2002/0140758 to Watrobski et al, in further view of US 6,705,715 to Morita et al.

Amended claim 1 is restricted to printer upgrade method that uses a printer cradle with a plurality of print engine controllers. The first print engine controller determines the performance characteristics of the cartridge and if the processing capacity of the first controller is insufficient, an additional print engine controller is engaged to operate the pagewidth printhead at a higher speed. Neither of the cited references discloses a printer with multiple controllers for selectively tailoring the processing capacity to the cartridge performance capability.

The citations fail to teach or suggest all the elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Jeong, Watrobski and Morita fail to support a §103 rejection.

Claim 3 stands rejected as obvious in light of Jeong, Watrobski and Morita, in view of US 6,033,053 to Eun. The Eun disclosure does not teach a plurality printer controllers that selectively engage to match the print speed capabilities of a cartridge. Therefore, the combined disclosures of Jeong, Watrobski, Morita and Eun fails to disclose all the elements of amended claim 1 and hence dependent claim 3.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected as obvious in light of Jeong, Watrobski and Morita, in view of US 6,851,799 to Trafton et al and in view of US6,238,115 to Silverbrook, respectively.

As discussed above, Jeong, Watrobski and Morita do not anticipate amended claims 1 or 2. Accordingly, the combined disclosures of Jeong, Watrobski, Morita and each of the additional references fail to support a §103 rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5.

### **Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762